



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/731,167	12/10/2003	Till Gerlach	54173	5074

7590

05/03/2005

Herbert B. Keil
KEIL & WEINKAUF
1350 Connecticut Ave., N.W.
Washington, DC 20036

EXAMINER

DAVIS, BRIAN J

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1621

DATE MAILED: 05/03/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/731,167	Applicant(s) GERLACH ET AL.	
	Examiner Brian J. Davis	Art Unit 1621	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 10 December 2003 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____. |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>12/10/03</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____. |

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: The specification is also objected to because it does not contain a Brief Description of the Drawing (heading and brief explanation of the drawing).

Drawings

The drawings are objected to because the figure should be clearly labeled i.e. "Figure 1". Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner,

Art Unit: 1621

the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 1-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for the hydrogenative amination of aliphatic aldehydes using catalysts whose preparation has involved precipitation of catalytically active compounds onto monolithic, tetragonal or cubic zirconium dioxide, does not reasonably provide enablement for the reduction of the universe of aliphatically unsaturated groups using catalysts whose preparation has involved precipitation of catalytically active compounds onto monolithic, tetragonal or cubic zirconium dioxide. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims.

With regard to rejections under 35 USC 112, first paragraph, the following factors are considered (*In re Wands* 8 USPQ 2d 1400, 1404 (CAFC 1988)): a) Breadth of claims; b) Nature of invention; c) State of the prior art; d) Level of ordinary skill in the art; e) Level of predictability in the art; f) Amount of direction and guidance provided by the

Art Unit: 1621

inventor; g) Working examples and; h) Level of experimentation needed to make or use the invention based on the content of the disclosure.

a)The claims are quite broad with respect to the compound prepared and starting materials used: the *universe* of aliphatically unsaturated groups used to produce a *universe* of (unknown) product, respectively.

b,c)The nature of the invention is determined in part by the state of the prior art. The prior art in general teaches processes related to that of the instant invention under specific reaction conditions. That is, starting materials, products, solvents, catalysts, temperature ranges etc. are explicitly defined.

d)The level of skill in the art is considered to be relatively high.

e)The level of predictability in the art is considered to be relatively low. Even under the best of circumstances, and several hundred years after Lavoisier laid the foundations of its modern practice, chemistry remains an experimental science.

f,g)The amount of direction provided by the inventor is considered to be determined by the specification and the working examples. Applicant provides one working example of the invention in accordance with the claims.

Art Unit: 1621

h) It simply is not possible to make and use the instant invention without an undue level of experimentation. The specification must teach how to make and use the invention, not how to figure out for oneself how to make and use the invention. *In re Gardner*, 166 USPQ 138 (CCPA 1970).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1 and 13-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The exact definition of the term "aliphatic" is unclear. Applicant has defined the term to include multiple bonds to nitrogen and oxygen (specification; claims 13-17). However, according to a standard reference (*Hawley's Condensed Chemical Dictionary*, 13th ed. (1997), p. 32) applicant's use of the term in such a fashion would seem to be a significant expansion of its accepted definition. While applicant may be his own lexicographer, applicant may not distort art-recognized terms. *Ex parte Klager*, 132 USPQ 203 (POBA 1959).

Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claim 9 recites the limitation "molar ratio of nickel to copper."

Art Unit: 1621

There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. There is no basis in claim 5 for a mixture of catalytic metals.

The remaining claims are also rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, as claims which depend from indefinite claims are also indefinite. *Ex parte Cordova*, 10 USPQ 2d 1949, 1952 (PTO Bd. App. 1989).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-6 and 10-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by US 6,034,029.

The key to the instant invention is the precipitation onto monoclinic, tetragonal or cubic zirconium dioxide of catalytically active components. US 6,034,029 teaches monoclinic zirconium dioxide having a large surface area (abstract). Doping by impregnation with transition metals is explicitly taught (column 4 line 21). These catalysts are explicitly taught as, inter alia, hydrogenation catalysts (column 4 line 25). Instant claims 11 and 12 have been included in the rejection as parameters such as temperature and pressure are considered to be mere engineering expediencies – absent unexpected results.

Art Unit: 1621

Claims 1-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by US 5,037,793, cited by applicant in the IDS.

The key to the instant invention is the precipitation onto monoclinic, tetragonal or cubic zirconium dioxide of catalytically active components. US 5,037,793 teaches a catalyst for the hydrogenation of unsaturated aliphatic compounds using a Ni/Cu catalyst (abstract). The catalysts may be prepared using up to 50% of solid zirconium dioxide (per force monoclinic, tetragonal and/or cubic) (column 2 line 30). Instant claims 11 and 12 have been included in the rejection as parameters such as temperature and pressure are considered to be mere engineering expediencies – absent unexpected results.

Claims 1-12, 14, 16 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by US 5,015,788, cited by applicant in the IDS.

The key to the instant invention is the precipitation onto monoclinic, tetragonal or cubic zirconium dioxide of catalytically active components. US 5,015,788 teaches a catalyst for the hydrogenation of acetylenic alcohols using a Ni/Cu catalyst (abstract). The catalysts may be prepared using up to 50% of solid zirconium dioxide (per force monoclinic, tetragonal and/or cubic) (column 2 line 30). Instant claims 11 and 12 have been included in the rejection as parameters such as temperature and pressure are considered to be mere engineering expediencies – absent unexpected results.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure: US 5,354,915 is cited to show a related process.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Brian J. Davis whose telephone number is 571-272-0638. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Johann Richter can be reached on 571-272-0646. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


BRIAN DAVIS
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Brian J. Davis
April 28, 2005